



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/584,796	06/01/2000	Fredrik Lindqvist	1410-679	4990
23117 7590 05/18/2007 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203			EXAMINER JAMAL, ALEXANDER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

20070514

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Enclosed is a fully signed copy of the Examiner's answer filed 2-8-2007. The examiner did not get the signatures of one of the conferees in the earlier filed action. No response is required from applicant.

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/584,796

Filing Date: June 01, 2000

Appellant(s): LINDQVIST ET AL.

John Lastova (33149)
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

MAILED

MAY 18 2007

Technology Center 2600

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 8-16-2006 appealing from the Office action mailed 8-9-2005.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

Art Unit: 2614

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

US Patent to Ho et al. (5317596)

Art Unit: 2614

US patent to Dowling (6597745)

US Patent to Chaffee et al. (5117418)

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1,3-7,9-17,20-28,30-43**, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ho et al. (5317596), and further in view of Dowling (6597745).

As per **claim 1**, Ho discloses an echo canceller used in a transceiver (ABSTRACT). The device comprises electronic circuitry configured to estimate and remove echo signals in the frequency domain (Fig. 3 Col 5 line 65 to Col 6 line 22). However, Ho does not disclose that the echo signals are estimated with a combination of both a product of a first matrix and transmitted symbol and a product of a second matrix and a previously transmitted symbol.

Dowling teaches an adaptive precoder that enables a block oriented receiver to recover a datastream in the presence of ISI and noise (ABSTRACT) that will reduce

computational complexity over previous implementations (Col 2 lines 40-55). He further suggests that the precoder may be implemented in (merged with) an echo canceller (Col 22 lines 1-17). The precoder detects and compensates for noise (and ISI) in the signal using a combination of both a product of a first matrix and transmitted symbol and a product of a second matrix and a previously transmitted symbol (Fig. 5 Col 17 lines 23-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application to implement the precoder's functionality with Ho's echo canceller to produce an echo signal (in the frequency domain) for the advantage that the precoder (and as such, the echo canceller) takes into account ISI and ICI (noise) and provides reduced computational complexity.

As per **claims 12,24,37,38**, claims rejected for same reasons as claim 1.

Additionally, Dowling discloses that the input signal vector may be multiplied with a column vector (Col 9 lines 15-55).

As per **claims 20,30,35**, claims rejected for same reasons as rejection of claim 1.

Additionally, Dowling discloses that the precoder takes into account the effects of ICI (Col 8 lines 60-67).

As per **claims 3,13,26,32,43**, Dowling discloses that the input vector (and as such, the delayed vector) is hermitian-symmetric and is divided into real and imaginary parts

(the imaginary parts are ignored) before matrix processing (Col 9 line 15 to Col 10 line 5).

As per **claims 4,5,22,31**, the first matrix (DOWLING: Figs 3,5) has coefficients that represent how an echo from a currently transmitted signal affects a received signal, and the second Matrix (DOWLING: Figs 4,5) represents how an echo from a previously transmitted signal affects the received signal.

As per **claims 6,7,34,36**, Ho discloses that the circuitry adapts the echo canceller coefficients (coefficients of the matrices) using a difference between the receive signal and the echo estimate signal using an lms algorithm (device 58, Fig. 3, Col 6 lines 50-62).

As per **claim 9**, Dowling discloses that the device may be implemented in a DMT transceiver (ABSTRACT).

As per **claim 10**, Dowling discloses that the Matrices may be $N \times N$ matrices (Col 7 lines 30-50).

As per **claims 11,33,42**, Dowling discloses that the device will function for a vector communication signal (which inherently includes, by definition, the transmit, receive, and echo estimate signals) such as a DMT system with Hermitian symmetric signal points (Col 2 lines 58-67).

As per **claims 14,15,23**, Dowling discloses a compensation (twiddle) factor (applied to both matrices) to compensate the previously transmitted signal that is a complex exponential term (Col 11 line 53 to Col 12 line 25, Col 14 lines 5-15). The twiddle factor is also applied to the triangular submatrix formed to compensate for a

cyclic prefix (Col 20 lines 49-60). Dowling also discloses the device is used in a DMT type transceiver (ABSTRACT).

As per **claims 16, 17,27,28,40,41**, Ho discloses that for applications involving asymmetric data, the signal should be decimated or interpolated as appropriate (Col 7 lines 49-62).

As per **claim 21**, claim rejected for same reasons as rejections of claims 1 and 9.

As per **claim 25,39**, the matrix is combined with a difference between the current transmit signal and the product of the delayed signal (previously transmitted) and the compensating factor in the matrix (as per rejection of claim 14) (DOWLING: Fig. 5).

3. **Claims 18,19** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaffee et al. (5117418), and further in view of Dowling (6597745).

As per **claim 18**, Chaffee discloses an echo canceller used in a transceiver (ABSTRACT). The device comprises electronic circuitry configured to estimate echo signals in the frequency domain, convert the estimate to the time-domain, then subtract the estimate in the time domain (Col 3 line 5 to Col 4 line 10). However, Chaffee does not disclose that the echo signals are estimated with a combination of both a product of a first matrix and transmitted symbol and a product of a second matrix and a previously transmitted symbol.

Dowling teaches an adaptive precoder that enables a block oriented receiver to recover a datastream in the presence of ISI and noise (ABSTRACT) that will reduce

computational complexity over previous implementations (Col 2 lines 40-55). He further suggests that the precoder may be implemented in (merged with) an echo canceller (Col 22 lines 1-17). The precoder detects and compensates for noise (and ISI) in the signal using a combination of both a product of a first matrix and transmitted symbol and a product of a second matrix and a previously transmitted symbol (Fig. 5 Col 17 lines 23-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application to implement the precoder's functionality with Chaffee's echo canceller to produce an echo signal (in the frequency domain) for the advantage that the precoder (and as such, the echo canceller) takes into account ISI and ICI (noise) and provides reduced computational complexity.

As per **claim 19**, claim rejected for same reasons as rejection of claim 18.

Additionally, Dowling discloses that the input signal vector may be multiplied with a vector (Col 9 lines 31-55).

4. **Claim 44** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaffee et al. (5117418) as applied to claim 35, and further in view of Dowling (6597745).

As per **claim 44**, Chaffee discloses an echo canceller used in a transceiver (method of reducing an echo) (ABSTRACT). The device comprises electronic circuitry configured to estimate echo signals in the frequency domain, convert the estimate to the time-domain, then subtract the estimate in the time domain (Col 3 line 5 to Col 4 line 10). However, Chaffee does not disclose that the echo signals are estimated with a

combination of both a product of a first matrix and transmitted symbol and a product of a second matrix and a previously transmitted symbol.

Dowling teaches an adaptive precoder that enables a block oriented receiver to recover a datastream in the presence of ISI and noise (ABSTRACT) that will reduce computational complexity over previous implementations (Col 2 lines 40-55). He further suggests that the precoder may be implemented in (merged with) an echo canceller (Col 22 lines 1-17). The precoder detects and compensates for noise (and ISI) in the signal using a combination of both a product of a first matrix and transmitted symbol and a product of a second matrix and a previously transmitted symbol (Fig. 5 Col 17 lines 23-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application to implement the precoder's functionality with Chaffee's echo canceller to produce an echo signal (in the frequency domain) for the advantage that the precoder (and as such, the echo canceller) takes into account ISI and ICI (noise) and provides reduced computational complexity.

(10) Response to Argument

Responses to Appellant's Argument A.

As per appellant's argument that Chaffee does not disclose an echo canceller that cancels echoes in the frequency domain (as per independent claims 1,12,18,19) (appellant's arguments page 8). Examiner notes that claims 1,12 do not refer to canceling the echo in the frequency domain, only estimating it. Examiner further notes that Chaffee is not used as a reference in rejecting independent claims 1,12. Examiner further notes

that independent claims 18,19 recite estimating the echo signal in the frequency domain and then canceling the echo estimate from the received signal in the time domain. Chafee does teach those elements: (CHAFFEE: Col 3 lines 10-25) teaches estimating echo in the frequency domain and (CHAFFEE: Col 4 lines 1-10) teaches canceling (subtracting) echo in the time domain.

As per appellant's argument that the Ho reference (used in rejecting claims 1,12) does not teach removing echo in the frequency domain (appellant's arguments page 8), examiner notes Fig. 3 of Ho where echo canceller 100 cancels a frequency domain echo estimate $E(f)$ from a received signal (path 104) via frequency domain subtractor 58.

Appellant makes the comment that Ho cannot remove echo due to a previous symbol in the frequency domain (appellant's arguments page 8). Examiner does not understand this statement because all echo is a delayed copy of a previously transmitted signal (symbol) and Ho functions to remove any echoes (caused by previous symbols). Examiner notes encoder 12 disclosed in Ho Fig. 3 which would comprise the functionality taught by Dowling's precoder (which includes the "combination of a product of a first matrix with a currently transmitted signal and a second matrix product with a previously transmitted signal"). Those computations would be taken into account by signal $X(f)$ (Ho Fig. 3) and $x(n)$ which are used by the echo canceller 100 in estimating (and subtracting) the echo signal.

Responses to Appellant's Argument B.

As per appellant's argument that Dowling discloses a pre-equalizer (pre-coder) that does not cancel echoes (appellant's arguments page 9), examiner agrees. However examiner notes that the claim rejections were made on either Ho or Chafee in view of the teachings of Dowling. Ho and Chafee disclose the echo cancellers. Dowling discloses a method of signal pre-coding that will reduce the effects of ISI and ICI. Dowling teaches a precoding stage that would be implemented in Ho as the 'encoder' block 12 (Ho, Fig. 3). Dowling even contemplates combining the functionality of the precoder with the echo canceller (Col 22 lines 1-5) as they are directed towards the same function: ie. reducing noise from signaling. Appellant argues that the distortion compensation taught by Dowling is completely different that the canceling of an echo disclosed by Ho and Chafee, examiner notes that they are two functions performed on a transmitted signal in order to reduce the noise in the signaling. Dowling pre-codes a signal but also contemplates that the precoding function be merged with an echo canceller.

Examiner repeats a section of response to appellant's arguments from the final office action dated 8-9-2005. Examiner notes that the use of near end and far end systems by appellant is arbitrary as the precoder and echo canceller could obviously be implemented at **both** ends of a communication system with the outgoing transmit signal being precoded and the incoming received signal being echo cancelled. For the sake of argument, examiner will explain the combination of Ho and Dowling in a 'near-end' situation. When Dowling's precoder is implemented (at the near-end) the signals that are transmitted out on the line will be the pre-coded signals. As such, in order for a near-end echo canceller to function correctly, it must analyze the outgoing signal and create an

echo estimate from that signal. Since the signal is a precoded signal, the precoded signal must be fed into the echo canceller so that the echo canceller can correctly estimate the echo that is going to be reflected back and potentially interfere with the received signal (this is shown in Ho Fig. 3 as the signal ENCODER 12 is implemented before the transmitted signal is fed into echo canceller 100). As such the echo estimate is created by 'using' (as per appellant's claim 1 language) a precoded signal, which is a combination of matrix coefficients of currently and previously transmitted signals. The Dowling reference clearly anticipates this combination when he states that an echo canceller may be '**merged**' with the precoder (as referenced in the previous office action). The Examiner has requested appellant to offer an explanation as to how the precoder and echo canceller would be merged (as per the disclosed prior art) and not function as per appellant's claim language, but appellant has offered no alternative explanation. Examiner notes that the precoding is used to mitigate interference between waveforms (carriers and symbols) within the outgoing signal, while the echo canceller is only concerned with estimating the echo of any signal that is being transmitted on the transmission line. They are being used for two different functions that may simultaneously be combined and implemented as contemplated in the Dowling reference. However, the echo canceller must take into account the precoded signal in order to effectively cancel the outgoing waveform echo (which is based off of the precoded output signal).

Responses to Appellant's Argument C.

As per appellant's arguments that compensating for channel distortion (as per Dowling) does not compensate for echo (as per Ho), examiner notes that Dowling teaches implementing an algorithm that makes a transmitted signal more resistant to ISI and ICI. The algorithm involves steps (product of various matrices for example) that read on the steps claimed by appellant. Dowling contemplates the combination of the precoding algorithm with an echo canceller because both act on the outgoing transmitted signal. Any echo canceller will have to be aware of the precoded signal in order to form an accurate echo estimate and function correctly (that is why Ho uses the encoded transmit signal to form the echo estimate in Fig. 3). Appellant poses the question "why would Dowling model/estimate echo at a near end station". Examiner notes that Ho/Chaffee are relied upon to teach estimating an echo at the near end. When combined with Dowling's precoder, the echo cancellers would estimate echo signals based off the precoded transmit signals and the estimate echo signals would take into account the improved resistance to ISI and ICI (an echo of a coded signal would maintain all the properties of the coded signal, it would be a delayed version at a lower amplitude). If the transmitted signals were resistant to ISI and ICI, then the respective echo estimates would also be resistant to ISI and ICI. This is the **same** function as claimed by appellant (note: appellant's spec page 4 lines 17-18. The precoding uses a model of the transmission channel (which includes the echo path) that takes ISI/ICI into account (Dowling), and the echo canceller estimates echo using a frequency domain model based off the precoded signal (Ho/Chaffee).

Responses to Appellant's Argument D.

As per appellant's arguments that Dowling's precoding is based on the transmission channel while the echo canceling is based off the echo channel transfer function (appellant's arguments page 11) and as such the prior art combinations fall short, examiner disagrees. The purpose of echo cancellers is to iteratively detect the echo path in order to produce an echo estimate. The echo path is detected using transmitted signals. An echo path estimate based off an ISI/ICI resistant precoded signal will be based off the transmission channel used in precoding the transmit signal. Examiner additionally notes appellant's own specification that contradicts appellant's arguments. Appellant's specification Background section page 3 lines 18-21 states that a received echo signal will also be affected by the ISI and ICI because all practical channels have memory. Examiner notes that "**the ISI and ICI**" refers to the ISI and ICI mentioned in the previous paragraph where appellant notes that ISI and ICI are based on the transmission channel. Again, this concept is already contemplated by Dowling when he discloses that the precoder and echo canceller may be **merged**.

Responses to Appellant's Argument E.

As per appellant's argument that Dowling's teaches would only serve to further distort the echo estimate, examiner does not understand appellant's point. Dowling does

not merely pre-equalize a signal according to an inverse channel estimate, Dowling provides an iterative encoding algorithm to increase the signal's resistance to ISI and ICI. Whatever function is performed on the transmit signal will be taken into account by the echo canceller because the encoded (or precoded) signal will be used when making the echo estimate (Note the Encoder 12 in Ho Fig. 3 that acts on the signal before it is sent to the echo canceller). Furthermore, examiner notes that echoes may arise from an impedance mismatch at any point of the transmission channel, so any precoding of a transmitted signal that reduces possible ISI or ICI will also reduce the ISI and ICI in the reflected echoes.

As per appellant's argument that combining the precoder/echo canceller destroys Dowling's purpose of a reduced complexity precoder structure, examiner notes that the 'precoder-structure' would not be increased in complexity, only merged with the functionality of an echo canceller. If anything the process would be less complex because operations common to the precoding/echo cancellation can be combined.

As per appellant's argument that Ho in view of Dowling would compensate for transmission channel ISI, not the echo ISI (appellant's arguments page 13 middle paragraph). The echo ISI is based off the transmission channel ISI as per appellant's specification page 3 lines 8-22 (as noted above). Examiner contends that the motivations to combine references as previously noted are adequate.

Responses to Appellant's Argument F.

As per appellant's arguments that Ho and Dowling do not compensate for Echo ICI and ISI. Examiner again notes appellant's specification page 3 that states that the echo ICI and ISI is based off the transmission channel ISI and ICI. An echo canceller using a precoded signal as a reference signal will estimate echoes of said precoded signal. If the reference signal takes into account ICI and ISI then the echo estimates will take into account ISI and ICI because the echo is based off the precoded, transmitted signals being applied to the transmission line.

Examiner further notes that ICI is dependant upon ISI (ISI can cause ICI) and reducing ISI in a signal will also function to reduce ICI in that signal. Appellant's specification notes that ICI may be caused by transients in the symbol transitions (specification page 3 lines 8-17). ISI may cause additional transistions which create additional ICI. Furthermore, examiner contends that the intra-block distortions mentioned by Dowling refer to ISI and the inter-block refers to ICI (DOWLING: Col 8 lines 60-67).

Art Unit: 2614

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Alexander Jamal

Conferees (pre-appeal conference made on 6-15-2006):

Curt Kuntz, Wing Chan




S-14-07



WING CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Conferee



CURT KUNTZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNICAL CENTER (MIL 2000)